

**CEDAR RIVER ANADROMOUS FISH COMMITTEE**  
**Final Meeting Minutes Summary**  
**September 14, 2000**  
**SPU Operations Control Center, 2700 Airport Way South, Seattle**

**Attendees:** Bruce Bachen, Bill Wells, SPU; Steve Foley, Brody Antipa, WDFW; Frank Urabeck, Northwest Marine Trade Association; Bill Robinson, Trout Unlimited; Scott Brewer, King County; Tom Sibley, NMFS; Sam Wright, Washington Trout; Mike Mahovlich, Muckleshoot Tribe, Gwill Ging, USFWS, Dennis Dorratcague, Montgomery Watson.

- I. Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 9:15 a.m.
- II. Approval of agenda.** The agenda was approved with the addition of an item to discuss the genetics contract.
- III. Minutes review and approval for August 22, 2000 meeting.** The minutes were changed from "July and August time frame are less critical" to indicate that there would be concern about protection of steelhead redds until mid-August. There were no other comments or changes and the minutes were approved as submitted with the one change as discussed.
- IV. Fish Passage Project:** Based on input from the agency engineers and concerns expressed by the AFC, the sorting facilities will be located near the Landsburg Dam rather than downstream in the park. The AFC discussed options for providing passage at the pipeline crossing. Replacing the section of the pipe that crosses the stream with a new section that would be placed below the streambed was discussed. Removal of the barrier would eliminate the need for passage facilities and return the stream to its natural state. Some concern was raised over the accumulated sediment behind the pipeline. Current estimates for construction costs, assuming that the less-expensive trench and bury approach is used as opposed to a tunneling option, range from \$3-4 million, far above the \$1.7 million allocated for passage and pipeline reinforcement. The AFC asked SPU to review the situation and determine if additional funding can be justified at this time for a capital improvement project. No decision was reached on which of the two ladder designs, vertical slot or pool and chute, would be preferred. Additional information and other input will be sought prior to the next meeting so passage alternatives can be ranked.

**Option 1A (Bury pipeline; open cut trenching)**

BENEFITS	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Unimpeded fish passage</li><li>• Increased habitat from restoration of natural channel above pipeline</li><li>• Good long-term solution</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Higher cost than Alt. 2 or 3, not in HCP (current estimate \$3M to \$4M)</li><li>• Short-term impacts from open trench pipe placement and old pipe removal</li><li>• Requires 2 seasons of instream work</li><li>• Uncertainty about what happens to gravel upstream of old pipe</li><li>• Additional environmental review and permitting time</li></ul>

- Special handling of gravel perched behind pipe

---

**Option 1B** (Bury pipeline; tunnel under river)

---

BENEFITS	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unimpeded fish passage</li> <li>• Increased habitat from restoration of natural channel above pipeline</li> <li>• Least impact to stream</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highest cost</li> <li>• Short-term stream impact from old pipe removal</li> </ul>

---

**Option 2** (Strengthen and stabilize aqueduct as planned; provide ladder over pipeline on left bank with exit immediately above pipeline)

---

BENEFITS	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction can be completed in a minimum of two years earlier than burial of pipeline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant short-term impacts from pipeline strengthening</li> <li>• Likely to require regular maintenance to remove gravel and debris</li> <li>• Possible delay of migrants in finding ladder entrance</li> </ul>

---

**Option 3** (Strengthen and stabilize aqueduct as planned; pool and chute ladder over pipeline on left bank; similar to one at Town Dam on the Yakima River)

---

BENEFITS	CONCERNS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less maintenance than conventional ladder</li> <li>• Less risk of flood damage and associated repair/maintenance under unfavorable conditions</li> <li>• Works over a range of flows</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term instream impact from pipeline strengthening</li> <li>• May require some regular maintenance to remove gravel and debris</li> <li>• Possible delay of migrants in finding ladder entrance</li> </ul>

---

**Sorting facilities and upstream passage:** Discussion of upstream passage and sorting facilities focussed on the post sorting return channel, the holding capacity assumption and the sorting approach. No problems were identified with a 150 ft return channel that will allow species except sockeye to return to the river after the sorting operation. The design capacity for presort holding was revised to a range of 750-1000 to allow greater flexibility in design of the holding tank. Two sorting approaches were identified: a locks system which provides flexibility in the amount of lift of the fish to be sorted, but relies on pumps and a Denil fish ladder that would provide more limited lift for sorting, but could work with water supplied by gravity. The committee did not indicate a preference for sorting operations nor any concerns with either option.

## V. Hatchery Development Program

### 1. Discussion of draft plans for:

a. **Alternative broodstock collection.** The HCP includes funding for the evaluation of options for collecting broodstock. Committee members felt that it was appropriate to focus on those methods that are likely to meet the goals of the program. There was support for developing a scope of work for an evaluation of weir designs, operations and locations that could benefit both current and potentially, future operations. The scope of work will be provided to the committee in October. Additional discussion will be needed with the committee to determine what other information is needed on alternative methods for collecting broodstock.

b. **Rearing evaluation plan.** Evaluation of short term rearing of sockeye fry is included in the HCP and scheduled to begin in the first year. A smaller group was asked to review and make whatever changes are needed to the draft study plan so that it is ready to present to the full committee for their approval.

VI. **Reports**

- A. **Hatchery guideline development** – Bruce explained that there have been three meetings of the expert panel, and that he is hoping to have a draft for the AFC to review in November.
- B. **Current conditions** - Steve gave a report on current conditions. He reported that there are about 15,000 live sockeye in the Cedar River and gave a comparison with previous years.
- C. **Coho return** - Mike gave a report on fish passing through the Ballard Locks. This appears to be a strong year for coho: numbers and size are up and a fishery may be held in Lake Washington.
- D. **Current status of broodstock collection** - Brody reported on broodstock collection. They currently are holding 756 females and 703 males, and have caught these fish with minimal fishing time. The holding facilities are full and a fourth holding tank is being added to expand holding capacity.

VII. **Plan next agenda** – The next agenda will include fish passage.

VIII. **Genetic work** – Bruce described a contract that will sustain the research of Dr. Paul Bentzen at University of Washington. Dr. Bentzen is studying the relationships between sockeye and kokanee populations in Lake Washington Basin and the Northwest through genetic analyses. He is also looking at variation between early run sockeye and late run sockeye and runs from year to year. Bruce explained that they are ready to sign a \$33,000 contract to continue this research. Bruce handed out the scope of work currently under consideration for the committee's review. No one objected to continuing the work; however only four members of the committee were present at this time.

IX. **Public Comment** – No one from the public attended the meeting.

X. Meeting adjourned at 1:20.